

In the United States Court of Federal Claims
OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS
No. 23-0016V

SHILO BIRNIE,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: December 29, 2023

*Catherine Wallace Costigan, Maglio Christopher & Toale, Washington, DC, for
Petitioner.*

Ryan Pohlman Miller, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

On January 5, 2023, Shilo Birnie filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*² (the “Vaccine Act”). Petitioner alleges that she suffered a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”) following a Tdap vaccination she received on June 7, 2021. Petition at ¶1, 18. Petitioner further alleges he suffered his SIRVA injury for longer than six months. Petition at ¶20. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

On December 29, 2023, Respondent filed his Rule 4(c) Report and Proffer of Damages (“Rule 4/Proffer”) in which he concedes that Petitioner is entitled to

¹ Because this Ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action taken in this case, it must be made publicly accessible and will be posted on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website, and/or at <https://www.govinfo.gov/app/collection/uscourts/national/cofc>, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2018) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the Ruling will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

² National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all section references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2018).

compensation in this case. Respondent's Rule 4/Proffer at 1. Respondent states that "Petitioner's alleged injury is consistent with SIRVA as defined by the Vaccine Injury Table. Specifically, Petitioner had no history of pain, inflammation, or dysfunction of her left shoulder prior to vaccination; pain occurred within 48 hours after receipt of an intramuscular vaccination; pain was limited to the shoulder in which the vaccine was administered; and no other condition or abnormality has been identified to explain Petitioner's shoulder pain." *Id.* at 6. Respondent further agrees that "Petitioner has satisfied all legal prerequisites for compensation under the Act." *Id.*

In view of Respondent's position and the evidence of record, I find that Petitioner is entitled to compensation.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Brian H. Corcoran

Brian H. Corcoran
Chief Special Master